



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,326	03/16/2001	Jon L. Cook	08049.0006	5362
22852	7590	06/23/2010		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER SALLARD, SHANNON S	
			ART UNIT 3628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/09,326

Applicant(s)

COOK ET AL.

Examiner

SHANNON S. SALIARD

Art Unit

3628

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16,54-59,89,90,96,97 and 101-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16,54-59,89,90,96,97 and 101-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/24/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant has amended claims 11, 14, 54, 57, 89, 90, 96, and 97. Claims 1-10, 17-53, 60-88, 91-95, and 98-100 have been cancelled. No claims have been newly added. Thus, claims 11-16, 54-59, 89-90, 96-97, and 101-104 remain pending and are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 18 March 2010, with respect to the rejections of claims 11-16, 101, and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Thus, the rejections of claims 11-16, 101, and 102 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 18 March 2010, with respect to the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues, "According to amended independent claim 11, the "static address database [uses]...the address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database that contains the standardized physical address of the user," wherein "the delivery point identification key contain[s] information specifying a storage location of the standardized physical address within the master address database" (emphasis added). In contrast, Kanevsky and Allen, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose at least the above elements of the claimed method for determining the standardized physical address." However, the

Examiner disagrees. The Examiner asserts that Allen discloses, "The destination address revealed by the decoded character information is processed by the circuit 90 in the USPS ZIP +4 database 104 to determine the delivery point ZIP code for the mailpiece. It will, of course, be understood that any other database including delivery points and corresponding delivery point ZIP codes (for example, the USA database) may be substituted for the ZIP+4 database. The delivery point information (comprised of the delivery point ZIP code and/or destination address) is then processed in an extract of the USPS National Change of Address (NCOA) database 106 (containing the name and former address of each addressee at each delivery point who has filed a change of address form with the USPS) to determine if a forwarding request has been logged against that delivery point. It will, of course, be understood that any other database including a list of addressee names, and former addresses (and forwarding addresses) may be substituted for the NCOA database. The circuit 90 then checks the delivery point information against the list of former addresses for that delivery point. If the addresses match, the character information for the digitized image of the mailpiece is accessed by the circuit 90 to decode the name of the addressee for comparison to the name of the person in the NCOA database 106 requesting forwarding of the mail. If the names match, the circuit 90 identifies the mailpiece as in need of forwarding, saves the character information for the digitized image at an address in the memory 102 for later access and directs the sorter 96 to send the mailpiece into the designated forwarding mail pocket 100 for collection and reprocessing in a manner to be described." (col 6, line 47-col 7, line 21. The Examiner notes that the ZIP+4 database is

interpreted to be the static address database and the NCOA database is interpreted to be master address database. Since the delivery point key obtained from the ZIP+4 database is used to obtain the physical address from the NCOA database, it is obvious that the delivery point key identifies the storage location of the address in the NCOA database. Specifically, the delivery point key is the link between the two databases and the delivery point key directs the computer to the correct storage location of the physical address in the NCOA database. Thus, Allen does disclose "address database [uses]...the address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database that contains the standardized physical address of the user," wherein "the delivery point identification key contain[s] information specifying a storage location of the standardized physical address within the master address database", as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

5. Applicant further argues, "In contrast to the Office Action's characterization that claim 11 recites that "the static address database contains the standardized physical address of the user" (Office Action, p. 5), claim 11 actually recites, that "the static address database us[es] the address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database that contains the standardized physical address of the user." Thus, according to claim 11, it is the master address database, rather than the static address database, that contains the standardized physical address of the user. Because the Office Action has not correctly considered claim 11 as a whole including all of the words of the claim, Applicants respectfully request the next Office Action be made *non-final*." As discussed above, since the delivery point key obtained

from the ZIP+4 database is used to obtain the physical address from the NCOA database, it is obvious that the delivery point key identifies the storage location of the address in the NCOA database. Specifically, the delivery point key is the link between the two databases and the delivery point key directs the computer to the correct storage location of the physical address in the NCOA database. Thus, Allen does disclose "address database [uses]...the address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database that contains the standardized physical address of the user," wherein "the delivery point identification key contain[s] information specifying a storage location of the standardized physical address within the master address database", as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 11-15, 54-58, 89, 90, 96, and 97** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al [US 6,285,777] in view of Allen et al [US 5,422,821].

As per **claims 11, 14, 54, 57, 89, 90, 96, and 97**, Kanevsky et al discloses a method comprising the steps of:

obtaining, using a first obtaining device, an address of the user from the electronic account [col 5, lines 44-49];

sending, using a sending device, the address of the user to a static address database [col 5, lines 55-59], the static address database contains the standardized physical address of the user, wherein the standardized physical address conforms to a standard format [col 5, line 49-col 6, line 8; see fig. 5 and descriptions thereof].

Kanevsky et al does not disclose using the address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database; receiving, using a receiving device, a delivery point identification key from the static address database, the delivery point identification key containing information specifying a storage location of the standardized physical address within the master address database; and obtaining the standardized physical address from the master address database using the delivery point identification key.

However, Allen et al discloses the known technique of using an address of the user to obtain a delivery point identification key from a master address database (Abstract; col 2, lines 50-65); receiving a delivery point identification key from the static address database, the delivery point identification key containing information specifying a storage location of the standardized physical address within the master address database (col 6, line 47-col 7, line 5); and obtaining the standardized physical address from the master address database using the delivery point identification key (col 7, lines 5-20). This known technique is applicable to the system of Kanevsky et al as they both share characteristics and capabilities, namely, they are directed to delivery of mail

items. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique of Allen et al would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system. It would have been recognized that applying the technique of Allen et al to the teachings of Kanevsky et al would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied shows the ability to incorporate such mail address matching features into similar systems. Further, applying the address matching technique of Allen et al to Kanevsky with email addresses stored accordingly, would have been recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art as resulting in an improved system that facilitate address retrieval from a database.

As per **claims 12 and 55**, Kanevsky et al does not disclose wherein the master address database is a United States Postal Service master address database. However, Allen et al discloses wherein the master address database is a United States Postal Service master address database [col 8, lines 19-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the addressing system of Kanevsky et al wherein the master address database is a United States Postal Service master address database as taught by Allen et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 13 and 56**, Kanevsky et al further discloses wherein the static address database is a United States Postal Service static monolithic address database [col 3, lines 59-61].

As per **claims 15 and 58**, Kanevsky et al further discloses wherein the address database contains a plurality of standardized addresses corresponding to a plurality of users, each standardized address conforming to a standard format [col 6, lines 1-4].

8. **Claims 16, 59, and 101-104** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky et al [US 6,285,777] in view of Allen et al [US 5,422,821] as applied to claim 11, 14, 15, 54, 57, and 58 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

As per **claims 16 and 59**, Kanevsky et al and Allen et al disclose all the limitations of claims 11, 14, 15, 54, 57, and 58. Kanevsky et al further discloses wherein the standard format includes a street and city [see Fig. 5]. Kanevsky et al and Allen et al do not disclose wherein the standard format includes street number, street name, city, state, and ZIP code. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known at the time of the invention that a standard address of a user contains street number, street name, city, state, and ZIP code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Kanevsky et al and Allen et al to include wherein the standard format includes street number, street name, city, state, and ZIP code, as known in the art, to advantageously facilitate mail identification.

As per **claims 101-104**, Kanevsky et al and Allen et al do not further disclose wherein the standard format of the standardized physical address comprises one of "delivery point", "plus 4", "5 digit", and "last line" standardization. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art at the time of the invention for a physical address to include at least one of "delivery point", "plus 4", "5 digit", and "last line". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Kanevsky et al and Allen et al to include wherein the standard format includes at least one of "delivery point", "plus 4", "5 digit", and "last line", as known in the art, to advantageously facilitate mail identification.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHANNON S. SALIARD whose telephone number is (571)272-5587. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231***

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-5587 [Informal/ Draft Communications, labeled
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Shannon S Saliard
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3628

/Shannon S Saliard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628